

OPINION 1191

BERYTUS CONSIMILIS HORVÁTH, 1855
(HEMIPTERA, BERYTINIDAE):
LECTOTYPE DESIGNATION CONFIRMED

RULING.— (1) The neotype designated by E. Wagner, 1966, for the nominal species *Berytus consimilis* Horváth, 1855, is hereby set aside.

(2) The lectotype designated by Péricart, 1976, for the above nominal species is hereby confirmed.

(3) The specific name *consimilis* Horváth, 1855, as published in the binomen *Berytus consimilis*, and as defined by reference to the lectotype designated by Péricart, 1976, is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2763.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2118

An application for the replacement of the neotype designated for *Berytus consimilis* Horváth, 1855 by Wagner, 1966 by a lectotype was first received from Monsieur J. Péricart (45 Montereau, France) on 7 April 1975. It was sent to the printer on 16 May 1975 and published on 30 January 1976 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 32, pp. 255–256. No use of the plenary powers was involved. No comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 5 September 1980 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1980)27 for or against the proposals published in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 32, p. 256. At the close of the voting period on 5 December 1980 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — twenty (20) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Willink, Mroczkowski, Starobogatov, Trjapitzin, Hahn, Brinck, Tortonese, Corliss, Dupuis, Habe, Welch, Alvarado, Cogger, Sabrosky, Heppell, Bayer, Halvorsen, Nye

Negative Vote: Lehtinen

Vokes was on leave of absence. No votes were returned by Bernardi, Binder and Kraus.

The following comments were sent in by members of the Commission with their voting papers:

Lehtinen: 'In Hemipteran species, the informative value of male characters is generally much higher than that of female

characters. As the neotype comes from the same geographic region as the series of syntypes, there are no reasons to suppose that possible patterns of geographic variation of this species could later cause confusion. A topotypic neotype stated to be conspecific with the syntypes by the applicant cannot threaten nomenclatural stability.

Ride: 'I vote against the proposal because it seems wiser to establish the taxonomy of the genus on Wagner's revision which, as the applicant has said, is based upon modern taxonomic criteria; and the neotype chosen by Wagner is undoubtedly conformable with the taxonomic concept established there. However, I vote on the assumption that the male genitalia are diagnostic of the genus (*sensu* Wagner) and that Wagner, in establishing the neotype, did so in conformity with Article 75a-c. I ask the Secretary to confirm these aspects. If Wagner did not fulfil the requirements of Article 75a-c, the Council should decide whether to seek action to validate the neotype under the plenary powers. If the male genitalia are not diagnostic and the female characters are, I ask for my vote to be disregarded.'

[Note by the Secretary: as requested by Dr. Ride, I examined Wagner's neotype designation. It was designated (a) in a revisory work in which the identities of closely similar species were studied, (b) not for its own sake, or as a matter of curatorial routine, or for a species whose name is not in general use, and (c) in a manner that satisfies the requirements of Article 75c. The neotype cannot, therefore, be invalidated on that score. I then consulted Dr. W.R. Dolling (*Natural History Museum, London*) on the question of which sex was the more diagnostic and he told me that the species could be recognised equally well from either sex. Under those circumstances, I decided to disregard Dr. Ride's vote. R.V.M.]

Sabrosky: 'In spite of the fact that the proposed lectotype would not be in the museum of the original series, I prefer that solution to help deter the unnecessary multiplication of neotypes when they are not really necessary.'

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following is the original reference for a name placed on an Official List by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

consimilis, *Berytus*, Horváth, 1855, *Rev. Entomol.* vol. 4, pp. 320-324.

The following is the original reference to a lectotype designation confirmed by the ruling given in the present Opinion: for *Berytus consimilis* Horváth, 1855 by Péricart, 1976, *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 32, pp. 255-256.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P.(80)27 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1191.

R.V. MELVILLE

Secretary

International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

London

13 March 1981